

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 132, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.111 and 1.114 in response to the Advisory Action mailed on January 16, 2007 and the Final Office Action mailed on September 21, 2006.

Summary of the Examiner's Action and Applicants' Response

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that the last response does not place the application into condition for allowance. The Examiner has, therefore, again rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,845) in view of Lonroth, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. This Amendment is submitted with a Request for Continued Examination filed herewith. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claim 19. Claims 1-7 have been cancelled. Claim 26 has been added. After entry of this Amendment, Claims 8-26 will be pending.

Response regarding the Rejection of Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Regarding Claims 8 and 13, the Examiner stated in the Advisory Action that:

“Wistendahl does not teach the two separate claimed steps receiving a geometric outline defined for a hot spot and assigning attributes for that geometrically defined hot spot based on the template (applicant's remarks, page 8). However, column 9 line 62 through column 10 line 57 of Wistendahl describe the manner in which object mapping takes place. In each of the examples given (where an author draws the geometric outline for each frame, identifying an unmoving object over successive frames, and tracking a moving object over successive frames), the object is outlined first, prior to defining a hyperlink between the outlined object and a function. Simply put, the method performed by Wistendahl must first find the object (outline it) before it can hyperlink it (assign an attribute based on an authored template).”

Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner's response above includes: “hyperlink it (assign an attribute based on an authored template)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is contending that the defining of a hyperlink for a geometrically outlined object in Wiesenthal, et al., i.e., “hyperlink it”, teaches “assign an attribute based on an authored template”. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 8 and 13 include the steps of creating a template that defines at least one attribute for

a hot spot; providing a graphical user interface for receiving from the user a geometric outline defining said hot spot on said single video frame; and assigning at least one attribute to said hot spot based on said template. Wistendahl, et al. states that:

“[u]sing an outlining tool similar to that provided in the ELASTIC REALITY 3TM software, the author can draw an outline around an object in the image field using a pointer or other cursor device, as indicated at box 50b. The outline, i.e., the display location coordinates of the pixel elements constituting the outline, and the frame address are saved as N Data at box 50c. Then using a hyperlinking tool similar to that provided in the LINKSWARETM software, the author can define a hyperlink between the object outlined, now specified as N Data, and another function to be performed by the IDM program, as indicated at box 50d. The hyperlink information is saved with the IDM program at box 50e. The procedure is iterated for all objects to be mapped in a frame and for all frames of the movie or video.” (Col. 10, lines 5-8). (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl, et al. teaches a procedure that includes defining a hyperlink for an outlined object and repeating the procedure for all objects. Thus, Applicants respectfully submits that Wistendahl, et al. does not teach or suggest assigning hyperlinks to a hotspot based on any template. Applicants respectfully submits, therefore, that Wistendahl, et al. does not teach assigning at least one attribute to said hot spot based on said template, as claimed in Claims 8 and 13.

Regarding the Examiner’s mention of object mapping in Wistendahl, et al., Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl, et al. teaches a user drawing an outline around an object in a frame and using that the same outline data for succeeding frames if the object appears in the same position in the other frames, i.e., the object is non-moving. (See Col. 9, lines 66- Col. 10, line 2, and Col. 10, lines 16 – 24). Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl, et al. also discloses storing the outline data of the first frame so it can be used for a sequence of frames having the non-moving object. (Col. 10, lines 16-18). Applicants respectfully submit that this “object mapping” in Wistendahl, et al. also does not teach or suggest assigning hyperlinks to a hotspot based on any template. Applicants respectfully submits that, for this additional reason, Wistendahl, et al. does not teach assigning at least one attribute to said hot spot based on said template, as claimed in Claims 8 and 13. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Lonnroth, et al. does not teach hot spots and thus does not teach Claims 8 and 13. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 8 and 13 are non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonnroth, et al.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the methods claimed in Claims 8 and 13 teach, as separate steps, the steps of receiving a geometric outline defined for a hot spot and assigning

attributes for that geometrically defined hot spot based on the template. Applicants respectfully submit that Wistendahl, et al. does not teach these separate steps for the method using a template, as claimed in Claims 8 and 13. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that the teaching in Wistendahl, et al. of storing an outline that can be reused (if an object is not moving between frames) does not teach creating a template on which attributes can be assigned to a hot spot, for a hot spot that has been defined by a geometric outline using a separate step, as claimed in Claims 8 and 13. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Wiesenthal, et al.'s teaching of reusing an outline for non-moving objects does not teach the template, as claimed in Claim 8 and 13. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 8 and 13 are non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonroth, et al., for this additional reason.

Claims 9-12 depend from Claim 8, and thus are respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonroth, et al. for the reasons as above for Claim 8. Claims 14-18 depend from Claim 13, and thus are respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonroth, et al. for the reasons given above for Claim 13.

Claim 19 has been amended to depend from Claim 13 and to remove several elements. Claim 19 depends from Claim 13, and thus is respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonroth, et al. for the reasons given above for Claim 13. Claims 20-25 depend from Claim 19, and thus are respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonroth, et al. for the same reasons as above for Claim 19.

NEW CLAIM

Applicants have added a new claim, Claim 26, which depends from Claim 14 and adds the limitation that the first format is adapted to a first language and the second format is adapted to a second language. This limitation had been in Claim 7, which has been cancelled herein. Claim 26 depends indirectly from Claim 13, and thus is respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Wistendahl, et al. in view of Lonroth, et al. for the reasons given above for Claim 13.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims, Claims 8-26, in the present application are allowable. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (415) 984-8200.

Respectfully submitted,



James W. Drapinski

Registration No. 46,242

Feb 21, 2007
Date
NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(415) 984-8200